

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/716,157	10/716,157 11/18/2003		Anthony E. Faltesek	90288	5301
24628	7590	11/02/2006		EXAMINER	
WELSH &	KATZ, I	LTD	LEE, PING		
120 S RIVEI	RSIDE PL	.AZA			
22ND FLOOR				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CHICAGO, IL 60606				2615	

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/716,157	FALTESEK ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
· .	Ping Lee	2615				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing  - earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tinwill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed  the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 O</u>	<u>ctober 2006</u> .					
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ⊠ This						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) <u>1-33</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) <u>1-33</u> is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.					
Application Papers	·					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). njected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)						
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary					
P) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   X Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)   Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Do 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/716,157 Page 2

Art Unit: 2615

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1, 2, 11-14, 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mori (US 4,851,823).

Regarding claims 1, 2, 22 and 23, Mori discloses a system comprising a plurality of audio modules ("I", located at each room) including at least one audio output transducer (2) and at least one audio input transducer (3), a common control unit ("II"), an output device (12) and an input device (11).

Regarding claims 11-14, Mori shows the display step by 16 (col. 2, lines 20-25) and the steps of processing by human.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

Application/Control Number: 10/716,157

Art Unit: 2615

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 9, 17, 18 and 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori.

Regarding claims 9, 17, 18 and 30-32, Mori fails to teach thermal sensors. Mori teaches a general fire detector (1), one skilled in the art would have expected that any well known functionally equivalent type of fire detector, including the one using thermal sensor, could be used without generating any unexpected result. Thus, depending on the design choice, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Mori by using a thermal type of fire detector in order to detect the fire.

6. Claims 10, 15 and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori as applied to claims 9, 17, 18 and 30-32 above, and further in view of Yoki et al (US 4,709,330).

Regarding claims 10, 15 and 19-21, Mori fails to show how to track the received audio and displaying movement. Yoki teaches how to use infrared sensor to detect the movement of the person in the location closed to the dire and help the person to escape from the fire. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Mori by incorporating infrared sensor as taught in Yokoi in order to help the guests to escape the dire when their vision is blurred by the smoke in the fire.

7. Claims 3-6, 8, 24-27, 29 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori as applied to claims 9, 17, 18 and 30-32 above, and further in view of Markowitz et al (US 6,295,346).

Regarding claims 3-6, 24-27, 29 and 33, Mori fails to how to analyze audio using circuitry or software. Markowitz et al (hereafter Markowitz) teaches how to use speech recognition software to help identify the urgent message from a remote location. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Mori by utilizing speech recognition software as taught in Markowitz in order to help the administer to correctly identify the message from the guests.

8. Claims 7, 16 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori as applied to claims 3-6, 8, 24-26, 29 and 33 above, and further in view of Cohen et al (US 6,219,643).

Regarding claims 7, 16 and 28, Markowitz fails to explicitly disclose the design of the speech recognition software including suppressing fire noise. Cohen et al (hereafter Cohen) teaches that it is important to eliminate the ambient noise while performing speech analysis. For detecting the speech during fire emergency, one skilled in the art would have recognized that the ambient noise would include the fire noise. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Mori and Markowitz by eliminating ambient noise as suggested by Cohen in order to clearly recognize the speech spoken by the guests in the fire emergency.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ping Lee whose telephone number is 571-272-7522.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Wednesday and Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vivian C. Chin can be reached on 571-272-7848. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

pwl